DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 847 JC 740 303

AUTHOR Deegan, William L.; And Others
TITLE Evaluating Community College Personnel: A Research Report.
PUB DATE 1 Mar 74
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Evaluation Techniques; *Faculty Evaluation; Instructional Improvement; *Personnel Evaluation; Post Secondary Education; Questionnaires; *State Surveys; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

A statewide survey was conducted of local evaluation policies, procedures, and problems of implementing evaluation programs on the campuses of California community colleges. The following areas were studied: (1) the process of development of the evaluation program; (2) procedures utilized in the first year of implementing Senate Bill 696 (evaluation of faculty members); (3) perceptions of the effectiveness of differing evaluation techniques; (4) problems encountered in implementing Senate Bill 696; and (5) recommendation for improving evaluation of certified personnel. Over 700 questionnaires were mailed to all community college presidents, all deans of instruction, all faculty senate presidents, all student body presidents, a random sample of nearly 200 community college faculty, and a sample of local community college trustees. In addition to the questionnaires, the survey team gathered written policies from over 90 community colleges and conducted an analysis of major features of board-adopted evaluation policies. Results of the survey showed that there was a decisive consensus among all groups that lack of administrative time and lack of faculty time were the major problems encountered in implementing a faculty evaluation program. Eight recommendations that evolved as a result of the study (three from respondents and five from the survey team) relate to: timing of and feedback from the evaluation process; inservice training; use of evaluation instruments; funding for inservice training; more experimentation; statewide clearinghouse; permanent local committes on the improvement of instruction; and further study. (DB)

ED 094847

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EVALUATING COMMUNITY COLLEGE PERSONNEL: A RESEARCH REPORT

William L. Deegan
Donald McHugh
William D. Plosser
Carmen J. Rosado
William P. Smith, Jr.

JC 740 303

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special gratitude is owed several organizations for their cooperation, willingness to provide what amounted to released time, and encouragement of staff members and representatives to participate in the project. Among these are the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, the California Junior College Association, and the Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges.

The contributions of the Chancellor's office of the California Community Colleges in compiling and analyzing data is most especially appreciated. In this connection, the survey team wishes to acknowledge its debt, and record its thanks, to three former members of the Chancellor's staff--Rebecca Singleton, Dr. Harlan Stamm, and Susan Ford.

Finally, may we take this opportunity to thank community college instructors, administrators, students, and trustees who took time away from something else in order to fill out the questionnaires and return them.

William L. Deegan, California Junior College Association
Donald McHugh, Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges
William D. Plosser, Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges
Carmen J. Rosada, Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges
William P. Smith, Jr., Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges

Sacramento, California

March 1, 1974

CONTENTS

	Page Numbers
BACKGROUND	1
Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation	1
Senate Bill 696	2
The Survey	3
Current Theories of Evaluation	4
DEVELOPING THE EVALUATION PROGRAMS	6
Resources	7
Techniques	8
DISTRICT POLICIES	11
Components of Evaluation	11
Three General Approaches to Evaluation	13
PERCEPTIONS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESSES	15
Relative Influence of Alternative Techniques of Evaluation	15
Effectiveness of Alternative Techniques of Evaluation	18
Problems Encountered	21
Effects of Evaluation Program on Campus Life	22
Changes in Roles of Participants	23
RECOMMENDATIONS	24
Respondents' Recommendations	24
Survey Team's Recommendations	25
SUMMARY	26

BACKGROUND

Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation

California's elected state representatives, acting in response to a public demand for a change in tenure law, voted in 1971 to alter substantially the tenure statutes for community college faculty members. This change went into effect on September 1, 1972, as a result of passage of Senate Bill 696 of the Regular Session of the California Legislature. Change in California came as a culmination of an unprecedented cooperative effort among community college organizations and agencies concerned with the California community colleges.

In December of 1969, community college representatives of private organizations and public agencies met to discuss the issues of tenure and evaluation of teaching. Participating in this meeting were representatives of the following organizations and agencies: Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges; American Association of University Professors, California Conference; California Chamber of Commerce Education Section; California Federation of Teachers, California Junior College Association; California School Boards Association; California Teachers Association, Community College Association Council; Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges; Coordinating Council for Higher Education, State of California; and Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges.

Thus was born the Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation for the California Community Colleges. The committee, composed of faculty representatives, met frequently for over a year and produced a report in early 1971 titled Administration of Tenure: Proposed Changes in Policies and Practices in the California Community Colleges. This report was submitted as an information item to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges at its February, 1971, meeting. The Board directed the Chancellor to assemble an advisory committee on tenure and evaluation composed of representatives from all segments of the community colleges and to have that advisory body report back to the April, 1971, meeting of the Board with recommendations.

What transpired next is described by Senator Albert S. Rodda, author of Senate Bill 696:

> ". . . representatives of community college school boards, administrators, students and faculty--working as an advisory body to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges--recommended several changes in tenure to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. In April . . ., the Board adopted a policy resolution based on the recommendations of the Chancellor's advisory committee which contained substantially the ingredients of the earlier Ad Hoc report."[1]

The framework of cooperation initially hoped for had now been achieved. Not only had all statewide faculty organizations signed the report

and te.cified on behalf of the Board resolution in April, 1971, but administrator., local board members, and the statewide Board of Governors were now in support of the chosen vehicle for change--Senate Bill 696. As Senator Rodda said after the bill was signed by Governor Ronald Reagan: "This new law is a remarkable example of cooperation among those holding different points of view on a major issue--tenure for community college certificated personnel."[2]

Senate Bill 696

There is no need to relate extensively the legislative history of the change in statutory provisions other than to mention that several tenure and evaluation bills were considered by the 1971 General Session of the California Legislature. Two were adopted--Senate Bill 696 for community college faculty members and Assembly Bill 293 for kindergarten through 12th grade teachers.

To help implement the new legislation, community college leaders from the coalition of organizations sponsored a two-day conference on evaluation early in December, 1971. The purpose of the conference was to develop principles and standards of evaluation for faculties. Under the direction of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, in conjunction with the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, the conference was attended by approximately 350 persons representing every community college in the state. Invited from each college were two faculty members, one board member, and one administrator.

In addition, the California Junior College Association held a statewide conference in April, 1972, at which experts on evaluation presented papers and discussed various alternatives to implementation of evaluation procedures and methods of achieving the goal of improved instruction.

The new law required that faculty members, as defined, must be evaluated periodically, at least once every two years for "regular" (permanent) teachers and at least once every year for "contract" (probationary) teachers. The new law also provided that:

> The governing board of each district in consultation with the faculty shall adopt rules and regulations establishing the specific procedures for the evaluation of its contract and regular employees on an individual basis and setting forth reasonable but specific standards which it expects its certificated employees to meet in the performance of their duties. Such procedures and standards shall be uniform for all contract employees and shall be uniform for all regular employees of the district.[3]

Local governing boards were designated as the public bodies responsible for adopting policies on evaluation of certificated personnel. Flexibility was built into Senate Bill 696 through the following provision:

". . . regulations shall permit and encourage a district governing board to establish evaluation procedures and standards which meet the particular needs of that district."[4]

The new legislation also mandated that:

> Rules and regulations adopted in relation to the evaluation process shall assure that the standards and procedures of the evaluation process in each district will be fair and in accordance with the intent of this act and that the evaluation processes of all of the districts are basically similar in substance and intent.[5]

Finally, it must be stressed that the fundamental goal of the new law as it relates to evaluation was to improve the quality of instruction in California's community colleges. The Legislature clearly indicated this as its legislative intent in adopting Senate Bill 696.

It was in a spirit of assistance to local districts that the survey which produced this report was undertaken. Hopefully, the trends, problems, successes, and recommendations contained in the report will contribute to the continued improvement of evaluation policies and practices.

The Survey

Midway through the first year of the new law's life (1972-73 academic year), members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation met to discuss progress in implementing Senate Bill 696 and ways of contributing to the success of the evaluation processes. In response to requests from a number of colleges, it was decided to form a survey team and to undertake a questionnaire survey of representatives of selected personnel categories involved in evaluation. After extensive discussion, the following major areas were agreed upon for study: (1) the process of development of the evaluation program; (2) procedures utilized in the first year of implementing Senate Bill 696; (3) perceptions of the effectiveness of differing evaluation techniques; (4) problems encountered in implementing Senate Bill 696; and (5) recommendations for improving evaluation of certificated personnel.

Over 700 questionnaires were mailed to the following groups: all community college presidents, all deans of instruction, all faculty senate presidents, all student body presidents, a random sample of nearly 200 community college faculty, and a sample of local community college trustees. Responses were received as follows:

1.	College presidents	44%	(N=98)
2.	Deans of instruction	55%	(N=98)
3.	Faculty senate presidents	43%	(N=98)
4.	Student body presidents	11%	(N=98)
5.	Random faculty	28%	(N=196)
6.	Trustees	63%	(N=30)

In addition to the questionnaire survey, the survey team gathered written policies from over 90 community colleges and conducted an analysis of major features of board-adopted evaluation policies.

Current Theories of Evaluation

Not only was there a practical concern for information about the initial implementation of Senate Bill 696, but the survey team also was interested in a number of theoretical issues at the heart of evaluation. Many of these issues served as a basis for the development of specific questions in the survey questionnaires.

Many evaluation practices in the past have been unfair and ineffective. Studies by Astin and Lee[6], Kent[7], and Cohen and Brawer[8] document some of the problems in past practices in evaluating community college teaching. Perhaps the current status of teacher evaluation was best summed up by Astin and Lee who wrote, "currently, most institutions, unwittingly perhaps, engage in evaluation practices which because they emphasize other academic activities stand in the way of improving undergraduate teaching. It is obvious that institutions suffer from an inability to evaluate classroom effectiveness. Undergraduate teaching will continue to be neglected until those who evaluate recognize and reward the faculty, find methods of accurately assessing teaching effectiveness. Only then will the high importance assigned to undergraduate teaching be more than a matter of lip service."

A review of the literature uncovers a number of problems in the evaluation of teaching which colleges considering developing evaluation programs should seek to avoid. Among the most serious problem is the failure to relate procedures for evaluation to the criteria and goals of evaluation. As Cohen and Brawer have written, "Evaluation of instructors is often an inconsistent exercise, archaic and in large measure unrelated to apparent purpose. An extensive recent survey of evaluation practices in California junior colleges revealed nothing to refute that contention."[9] A second problem concerns evaluation instruments developed for and by students. Many of these instruments are neither systematic nor objective and, as Kent has written based on a large survey of evaluation instruments, "judging from most of the rating forms which I looked at, I must conclude that too often there are good grounds for the faculty members distrust of devices now used for student evaluations."[10] Among the serious pitfalls of student evaluation instruments are instruments which are biased toward the academic showman, which favor the easy grader, which lack validity or reliability as assessment tools, which fail to recognize differences among levels of education or special needs of subject matter areas, and which fail to give a balanced assessment of both good and bad aspects of the course and of the teaching. Another problem with the evaluation of teaching by students involves the lack of return of survey instruments. Despite all the professed student interest in teacher evaluation, many colleges encounter very low percentage returns of survey instruments from students. Returns of five to ten percent of the student body are not uncommon and, unfortunately, many of these returns come from those most impressed with the instructor or those most critical. Reports based on these kinds of biased returns can become weapons for personal attack or can present a distorted perspective on the effectiveness of the teacher. A final major problem in the evaluation of teaching is the compounding of the

problems of inadequate criteria, biased instruments, and small percentage returns of survey instruments, by publishing the results of these "findings" in student guides to courses.

Despite these problems, the demands of the public and the legislatures for more effective evaluation of teaching must be heeded. Special care must be taken to assure that evaluations are balanced in approach and not used as weapons for attack on tenure or academic freedom. As James Jarrett has written, "the question cannot be whether evaluation will occur, but only how it can be more sensitively contrived and its results more intelligently used."[11]

DEVELOPING THE EVALUATION PROGRAMS

The survey team was interested in assessing the representativeness and the kind of involvement in the development of the evaluation program. On a district basis, fewer than 50 percent of the community college presidents responding participated as members of the district evaluation committee, and fewer than 50 percent of the presidents participated as members of college evaluation committees. By contrast, over 73 percent of the deans of instruction participated on the district evaluation committee and 90 percent of the deans of instruction participated on the college evaluation committees. About 25 percent of the faculty senate presidents participated on district evaluation committees and over 50 percent of the senate presidents participated on the college committees. Unfortunately, no information was given as to whether this participation by faculty senate presidents was personal as a faculty member, or as the faculty senate president. Of the sample of random faculty responding, 20 percent participated both on the district committee and on the college evaluation committees. No trustees contacted served on any of these committees, but over two-thirds of the responding students indicated that they had served on the district evaluation committee, and over 90 percent who did serve were voting members of the district evaluation committee.

The primary source of factual information about the development of evaluation programs, in the view of the study team, was the deans of instruction. As indicated previously, close to 75 percent of the deans of instruction participated on district committees, and 90 percent participated on the college committees. The survey team did check responses from the other respondent groups surveyed, and found that, in general, there was little or no discrepancy among respondent categories in reporting procedures for the development of the evaluation program.

At the time of the survey, May, 1973, over 85 percent of the colleges responding reported that the local boards of trustees had adopted a policy and regulations for evaluating certificated employees. The deans of instruction indicated that the policies adopted by the board of trustees in about 50 percent of the cases was exactly as recommended by the district evaluation committee. About 30 percent of the deans reported that the policy was modified slightly by the board from what the district evaluation committee recommended, and only one college reported substantial modification from the recommendation of the district evaluation committee. Evaluation policies and procedures generally cover administrators, faculty members, counselors, and librarians. Fifteen colleges reported policies covering part-time employees.

In terms of committee composition, of 4[illegible] colleges responding to the survey, district evaluation committees were generally composed of administrators, faculty, and students. The chairman of the district evaluation committee was <u>appointed</u> in 35 of the colleges and was <u>elected</u> in seven districts. All

administrative representatives to the committee were appointed. While faculty and students were also appointed to the committee, the survey team suspects (based on followup conversations) that they were appointed by their peers rather than by administrators.

In recent years there has been a trend toward increased use of task forces as opposed to committees which currently exist within the college structure. Respondents were asked whether evaluation committees were part of the existing structure or whether special task forces or ad hoc committees were created. Over 80 percent of the responding colleges indicated that a special committee was created for the development of evaluation procedures. Seven colleges reported that the policies were developed by an existing committee, and one district reported that separate college committees handled the development of their own unique evaluation policy.

Another problem frequently cited in state-local relationships is the problem of state imposed practices, rules, forms to fill out, etc., which create additional work and cost, but which frequently are not funded by the state, or are funded at an inadequate level. While precise answers to questions of time and costs of development of the evaluation program are difficult to obtain without detailed case studies and interviews, respondents did indicate that work in the development of evaluation procedures took an average of 15 to 20 meetings of the district evaluation committee during the year. These meetings lasted an average of two hours, and there were certainly numerous other meetings of subcommittees, campus groups, faculty and administrative groups, and significant efforts by individuals who were interested in the development of evaluation procedures. It should be pointed out that all of this work occurred on top of already full schedules of those involved, and at a considerable cost to the districts in time, money, and energy.

Resources

One of the problems that colleges face in implementing mandated tasks is the discovery of usable resources which can contribute to the completion of the task. Respondents were asked to indicate the kinds of resources they used in the development of district evaluation procedures. In developing procedures for evaluating faculty and administrators, the approach most frequently used was the development of a unique model to meet the individual needs of the district. A large number of colleges used resource materials gathered at the workshops sponsored by the faculty groups and the Chancellor's office in December, and by the California Junior College Association in April of the preceding year. Many existing models were reviewed, other campuses were contacted, and information was exchanged before a model acceptable for the unique campus situation was developed. Surprisingly, outside consultants other than those who reported at the statewide meetings were used by only three of the reporting colleges. Table I indicates the kinds of resources used in developing district evaluation procedures.

TABLE I

Resources Used in Developing
District Evaluation Procedures

Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty Members	Procedures for Evaluation of Administrators	
25*	24	1. Existing models were reviewed and an existing model was adopted for this campus.
3	2	2. Outside consultants met with committee.
34	27	3. Developed a model of our own.
3	3	4. Procedures developed by group outside of college.
12	9	5. Each committee member developed a special part of procedure.
31	26	6. Used material gathered at workshops presented last year.
20	14	7. Other campus groups or organizations submitted guideline recommendations.

*Number of colleges reporting.

Techniques

Another area of concern was the question of which parts of the evaluation procedure would be mandatory and which would be optional. There is often great concern over the use of such techniques as student evaluation forms, classroom visits by administrators or outside consultants, and discussion about teacher competency. There naturally is concern over any evaluation, and the specific form of evaluation and whether that form is mandated or optional can become an area of great controversy. Table II indicates the techniques that were part of the evaluation program and whether the techniques were mandatory or optional.

TABLE II

Techniques That Are a Part of the
Teaching Faculty Evaluation Program

Mandatory	Optional		
18*	24	1.	Classroom visits by administrators.
15	23	2.	Classroom visits by faculty from the same department/division.
4	23	3.	Classroom visits by faculty from the same department/division and some outside departments/ divisions.
1	23	4.	Classroom visits by faculty from outside the department/division.
25	17	5.	Self-evaluation.
31	13	6.	Student evaluation check lists/forms.
0	11	7.	Student team visits to classrooms.
1	13	8.	Discussions between students and the teacher.
24	14	9.	Discussions between peer evaluators and the teacher.
23	17	10.	Discussions among administrators, peer evaluators, and the teacher.
0	20	11.	Video tapes of teaching and replay.
9	16	12.	Achievement of stated course objectives.

*Number of colleges reporting.

The highest ranking mandated evaluation techniques were student evaluation check lists or forms (31 colleges), self-evaluation (25 colleges), discussions between peer evaluators and the teacher (24 colleges), and discussions among administrators, peer evaluators, and the teachers (23 colleges). Interestingly, student evaluation which has been an area of great concern was not only the most frequently mandated item, but was also rated as a very strong influence on the final teacher evaluation and as a fairly effective evaluation technique by both deans of instruction and presidents of academic senates.

Administrative evaluation criteria was, because of the nature of the task, different, but attempts were made to make procedures parallel. Techniques for the evaluation of administrators which were either mandatory or optional in the administrative evaluation program are reported in Table III.

TABLE III

Techniques That Are a Part of the Administration Evaluation Program

Mandatory	Optional		
25*	12	1.	Written statement of competence by the administrator's immediate superior.
29	12	2.	Indepth discussions between the administrator and his immediate superior.
19	11	3.	Peer evaluation.
22	14	4.	Faculty evaluation.
24	10	5.	Self-evaluation.
3	19	6.	Student evaluation.
8	7	7.	Multi-level committee evaluation (i.e., student, faculty, administrator, etc.)
10	14	8.	Achievement of stated administrative objectives.

*Number of colleges reporting.

The most frequently reported mandatory items were indepth discussions between the administrator and his immediate superior (29 colleges), written statements of competence by the administrator's immediate superior (25 colleges), self-evaluation (24 colleges), and faculty evaluation (22 colleges). Those evaluation techniques for administrators reported having the greatest influence on the evaluation were indepth discussions between the administrator and his immediate superior (24 colleges), written statements of competence by the administrator's superior (22 colleges), and self-evaluation (13 colleges).

DISTRICT POLICIES

Over 90 percent of the colleges submitted copies of the evaluation policies and procedures approved by local boards of trustees. An analysis of these policies and procedures uncovered a number of principles which the colleges appeared to hold as basic to successful evaluation. These guiding principles included:

1. A positive approach of evaluation for improvement of instruction would best be accepted if the professional staff has an integral part in developing an evaluation program;

2. In an objective evaluation, personnel involved are informed as to the evaluation criteria and procedures;

3. The results of evaluation must be reported and communicated adequately to the teacher by those making the evaluation; and

4. Regularized means of review and a due process procedure should be present.

Components of Evaluation

The policies and procedures submitted to the survey team revealed that the following evaluative techniques are most commonly employed:

Self-Evaluation: This usually includes assessment of efforts toward accomplishment of goals and self-development plans. The self-evaluation most often occurs after classroom observations by other faculty members and involvement by an administrator. Several community colleges use a standard form that the instructor completes for his own evaluation. Most colleges provide guidelines for preparation of a self-evaluation summary report.

Peer Evaluation: The most widely used peer evaluation method is by classroom observation, including consultation with the instructor prior to and following classroom visits. Selection of those who will conduct the evaluation may be made by:

1. The teacher--selecting from among faculty within the department;

2. The department chairman--selecting from among faculty within the department;

3. The dean of instruction--in consultation with department chairman selecting from faculty members within departments and from other departments.

Peer evaluation may be conducted through a team effort and may include the department chairman and the dean of instruction, or it may be conducted separately from other levels of evaluation.

An alternate method to peer evaluation discussed above is the "Peer Group Evaluation" utilized by at least one of the community colleges. Peer groups are established at the beginning of the academic year. They may cross departmental lines, and generally they consist of from three to six faculty members, each acceptable to the other members. A majority of the group members must be regular faculty. Peer groups meet at least twice a month for the purpose of achieving improved instruction, with performance evaluation a secondary purpose. Interchanges of classroom observations are made at the request of members of the group, and immediate feedback is provided to each peer group member to facilitate improved instruction. For formal evaluation reports, peer groups compile and summarize information gathered during peer group meetings and classroom visits. Individual reports are presented in meetings with an administrator (usually the department chairman) who is directly concerned with the evaluation of a particular faculty member. The report may become a part of the personnel file of the faculty member involved or may be filed in a separate evaluation file maintained by an administrator. At the request of the individual instructor, administrator, or a simple majority of the peer group members involved in the evaluation process, the personnel committee of the faculty senate may act as a reviewing board before any other action is taken.

Student Evaluation: The procedure for student evaluation usually takes the form of a questionnaire with multiple choice items and a provision for questions that permit students to make narrative responses. In several multicollege districts, a district-wide standardized student evaluation questionnaire is utilized and results are compiled at the district level. Other methods of student evaluation reported to the survey team include:

1. An instructor may develop a student evaluation instrument for his/her classes which focuses on the course objectives of the particular class, course content, and how well the student felt that the instructor met the course objectives;

2. The faculty member being evaluated compiles student initiated comments concerning the course, and attaches his/her own comments. These are submitted with his/her self-evaluation to the appropriate person or committee.

3. A committee of faculty within a department develops a student evaluation instrument for use within the department which emphasizes teaching techniques, student perception of accomplishments and overall performance of faculty being evaluated.

Administrative Evaluation of Faculty: Deans of instruction usually have responsibility for coordinating the campus evaluation program. Heads of departments/divisions and deans of instruction may be involved in the evaluation process in a number of ways including:

1. As members of an evaluation team;

2. In meetings where results of evaluation are discussed with faculty peer groups;

3. In visits to classrooms to observe instructors; and

4. In consultation with faculty members prior to and following an evaluation.

Three General Approaches to Evaluation

An analysis of district evaluation policies and procedures revealed three distinct approaches to evaluation which might be labeled traditional, modified traditional, and developmental. The following is a brief description of the typical features of the three approaches.

Traditional: In the traditional approach to evaluation, an administrator visits the teacher's classroom and then holds a conference in which the administrator's observations are discussed. The administrator prepares a final evaluation report which is signed by the administrator and teacher and then placed in the teacher's permanent personnel folder. The report may include input from other sources--self, student, and other faculty or administrator evaluations--but in this style the responsibility for deciding what other sources are used and how the material from these sources is interpreted is the responsibility of the administrator.

Modified Traditional: This approach is characterized by more sharing of responsibilities in the evaluation procedures and more choices for the teacher being evaluated. Typically, an evaluation committee is formed with the responsibilities of arranging classroom visits, holding conferences with the teacher, collecting evaluative data and interpreting it, and writing a final evaluation report. This committee is generally composed of an administrator (usually the teacher's immediate supervisor or division chairman, who may or may not be the chairman of the committee), regular faculty from the same division as the teacher being evaluated, and sometimes faculty from another division. The instructor may be able to choose faculty whom he/she prefers to be on the committee or at least is asked to concur with an administrative choice. Some evaluation committees are formed to evaluate all regular teachers to be evaluated that year in a division. A few colleges have a rotation system whereby all regular teachers would have an opportunity to serve on an evaluation committee. The teacher being evaluated has some options under this approach, such as participation in the selection of his/her evaluation committee, a choice of classes to be evaluated, and a choice of the instruments to be used for evaluation.

Developmental: While there are variations in the policies reported by the districts, the basic idea of the developmental approach is perhaps best described by Case (1971) who wrote:

> ". . . the Developmental Model stresses growth and positive re-inforcement. It is predicated upon principles of collegiality and small group interaction. The Developmental Model reduces the importance of the evaluation process to a relatively smaller role in the total growth program for the instructor. Evaluation becomes an integral, continual aspect

> of the attainment of professional competence, extending beyond subject matter competence into those related realms that bear heavily, although sometimes indirectly, upon classroom activities."[12]

Collegiality is at the heart of the developmental approach. Peer involvement and small group interaction are key components in the developmental model in contrast to more formal and standardized techniques in the other approaches.

In addition to examining the process of developing the district evaluation programs, and the contents of the board-adopted policies and procedures themselves, the survey team was interested in assessing the reactions of those persons involved in the evaluation program.

The sections that follow report the perceptions of respondents about the relative influence of alternative means of evaluation, the effectiveness of different evaluative techniques, the problems encountered in initiating and conducting local evaluation programs, an assessment of the effects of the entire evaluation program on certain aspects of campus life, and finally any proposed changes in the roles of participants in the evaluation process.

Relative Influence of Alternative Techniques of Evaluation

Respondents were asked to indicate whether several specific evaluative techniques had a strong, moderate, or minor influence on the overall evaluation of both teaching faculty members and administrators.

Table IV reports perceptions of the relative influence of alternative techniques on faculty evaluation.

While there was great diversity in responses, there was consensus among the reporting groups on four techniques as having strong influence on faculty evaluation. Self-evaluation, classroom visits by faculty from the same department or division, discussions between peer evaluators and teachers, and discussions among administrators, peer evaluators, and teachers were perceived as having a strong influence on faculty evaluation. Interestingly, the most frequently reported strong influence on faculty evaluation, perceived by deans and senate presidents, was the controversial technique of student evaluation check lists and forms.

Table V reports perceptions of relative influence of alternative techniques on administrative evaluation.

Again, while there was diversity of response, there was consensus among the three reporting groups, A written statement of competence by administrator's immediate superior and indepth discussions between administrator and immediate superior were the most frequently reported strong influences. Peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and faculty evaluation were also frequently reported strong influences. Although many colleges do not yet employ an objective-based approach to administration, a significant number of presidents and deans did report the use of achievement of stated administrative objectives as a strong influence on administrative evaluation. In contrast to student evaluation of faculty, student evaluation of administrators was rated as a very minor influence by all three reporting groups.

TABLE IV

Perceptions of the Relative Influence of Alternative Techniques on Faculty Evaluation

	Presidents St/Mo/Mi	Deans of Instruction St/Mo/Mi	Faculty Senate Presidents St/Mo/Mi	Random Faculty St/Mo/Mi
Classroom visits by administrators	17 9 9*	18 14 11	7 10 11	13 13 13
Classroom visits by faculty from same department/division	21 14 2	22 14 4	13 15 7	19 10 7
Classroom visits by faculty from same department/division and some outside departments/divisions	8 8 9	13 12 8	7 9 8	6 14 8
Classroom visits by faculty from outside department/division	8 4 10	6 8 12	3 8 9	3 9 13
Self-evaluation	21 14 3	17 15 7	16 4 10	26 9 4
Student evaluation check lists/forms	10 16 10	25 13 3	21 9 6	18 13 7
Student team visits to classrooms	0 1 4	0 1 9	0 0 6	2 1 17
Discussions between students and teacher	4 6 4	1 9 4	4 3 7	7 6 8
Discussions between peer evaluators and teacher	18 12 2	17 12 5	15 8 9	22 9 2
Discussions among administrators, peer evaluators, and teacher	24 9 1	23 11 5	14 8 4	16 13 6
Video tapes of teaching and replay	2 5 5	6 9	0 1 12	3 0 14
Achievement of stated course objectives	5 9 4	6 10 5	10 1 5	10 8 8
Other	1 0 0	1 0 0	0 0 0	4 0 2

*Number of respondents reporting.

Key

St = Strong influence
Mo = Moderate influence
Mi = Minor influence

TABLE V

Perceptions of Relative Influence of Alternative Techniques on Administrative Evaluation

	Presidents St/Mo/Mi	Deans of Instruction St/Mo/Mi	Faculty Senate Presidents St/Mo/Mi
Written statement of competence by administrator's immediate superior	26 3 1*	22 8 2	13 4 1
Indepth discussions between administrator and immediate superior	28 5 0	24 12 1	8 4 1
Peer evaluation	14 11 4	12 11 8	4 9 3
Faculty evaluation	10 14 3	10 17 5	7 6 4
Self-evaluation	11 14 4	13 15 4	5 7 5
Student evaluation	2 7 7	1 9 12	1 5 14
Multi-level committee evaluation (i.e., student, faculty, administrator, etc.)	7 4 3	5 6 6	4 2 3
Achievement of stated administrative objectives	12 5 2	11 7 6	4 5 0
Other	0 1 0	1 0 0	0 0 0

*Number of respondents reporting.

KEY

St = Strong influence
Mo = Moderate influence
Mi = Minor influence

Effectiveness of Alternative Techniques of Evaluation

Respondents were asked next to give their perceptions of the relative effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of several specific evaluative techniques utilized to evaluate both teaching faculty members and administrators.

Table VI reports perceptions of the effectiveness of alternative techniques for faculty evaluation.

There was consensus among the four reporting groups that student evaluation check lists and forms, discussions between peer evaluators and teachers, classroom visits by faculty from the same department or division, and discussions among administrators, peer evaluators, and teachers were effective evaluative techniques for faculty evaluation. As expected, there were also some sharp differences of opinion among the groups. Administrators ranked classroom visits by administrators as being very effective or fairly effective techniques for faculty evaluation, while faculty ranked this technique as being not very effective or ineffective. Conversely, faculty and deans of instruction ranked self-evaluation as being very effective or fairly effective as a faculty evaluation technique, while presidents were less enthusiastic about self-evaluation.

Table VII reports perceptions of the effectiveness of alternative techniques for administrative evaluation.

There was a high degree of consensus among all three groups regarding the effectiveness of differing administrative evaluative techniques. Indepth discussions between immediate superiors and administrators, written statements of competence by immediate superiors, peer evaluation, and self-evaluation were the highest ranked techniques. The least effective technique perceived by respondents was student evaluation of administrators.

TABLE VI

Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Alternative Techniques for Faculty Evaluation

	Very Effective/ Fairly Effective				Not Very Effective/ Ineffective			
	P	DI	FSP	RF	P	DI	FSP	RF
Classroom visits by administrators	30	34	13	18*	8	9	18	16
Classroom visits by faculty from same department/division	33	37	28	34	1	3	0	3
Classroom visits by faculty from same department/division and some outside departments/divisions	16	22	23	22	7	4	0	4
Classroom visits by faculty from outside department/ division	15	16	19	10	6	6	2	8
Self-evaluation	15	35	27	40	5	5	6	1
Student evaluation check lists/forms	29	41	34	40	4	2	3	5
Student team visits to classrooms	3	2	4	6	4	6	4	8
Discussions between students and teacher	10	14	21	24	2	4	2	2
Discussions between peer evaluators and teacher	31	33	32	38	1	3	0	3
Discussions among administrators, peer evaluators, and teacher	28	39	21	32	1	1	4	2
Video tapes of teaching and replay	9	15	10	12	0	2	0	4
Achievement of stated course objectives	18	24	13	22	1	5	2	2
Other	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0

*Numbers indicate respondents reporting.

Key
P = President
DI = Dean of Instruction
FSP = Faculty Senate President
RF = Random Faculty

TABLE VII

Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Alternative Techniques for Administrative Evaluation

	Very Effective/ Fairly Effective			Not Very Effective/ Ineffective		
	P	DI	FSP	P	DI	FSP
Written statement of competence by administrator's immediate superior	31	37	16*	0	0	3
Indepth discussions between administrator and immediate superior	38	36	20	0	1	2
Peer evaluation	23	30	21	1	2	2
Faculty evaluation	22	21	13	3	3	0
Self-evaluation	25	27	15	2	3	3
Student evaluation	9	11	11	3	5	4
Multi-level committee evaluation (i.e., student, faculty, administrator, etc.)	12	12	8	1	4	1
Achievement of stated administrative objectives	21	24	11	0	1	2
Other	1	2	1	0	0	0

*Numbers indicate respondents reporting.

KEY

P = President
DI = Dean of Instruction
FSP = Faculty Senate President

Problems Encountered

The four groups--presidents, deans of instruction, faculty senate presidents, and random faculty--were asked to provide their perceptions of the problems encountered in implementing an evaluation program for faculty members as required by Senate Bill 696.

The results are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

Perceptions of Major Problems Encountered in Implementing Teaching Faculty Evaluation Program
(As Reported By Segment)

	Presidents	Deans of Instruction	Faculty Senate Presidents	Random Faculty Sample
Faculty resistance	11%	8%	5%	13%
Administrative resistance	4%	2%	3%	4%
Low percentage of student return the evaluation instrument	4%	5%	3%	6%
Lack of administrative time	28%	29%	15%	19%
Lack of faculty time	28%	26%	27%	27%
Lack of money	10%	15%	6%	4%
Lack of interest in program by:				
Faculty	6%	8%	17%	12%
Students	3%	4%	7%	10%
Administrators	3%	1%	6%	2%
Trustees	---	1%	3%	2%
Other	3%	1%	8%	1%
TOTALS	100%	100%	100%	100%

There was a decisive consensus among all groups that lack of administrative time and lack of faculty time were the major problems encountered in implementing a faculty evaluation program. Other major problems reported were presidents' concerns about faculty resistance (11%) and lack of money to implement the program(10%). Deans of instruction were concerned about lack of money (15%), faculty resistance (8%), and lack of faculty interest in the program (8%). Faculty senate presidents were concerned about lack of money to implement the program (17%) and the random faculty reported faculty resistance (13%), lack of faculty interest (12%), and lack of student interest (10%), as additional major problems in implementing the teaching faculty evaluation program.

Effects of Evaluation Program on Campus Life

In this section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked for their judgments about the effects of the evaluation program on certain aspects of campus life.

Respondents were asked whether the evaluation program contributed to improved instruction at their college. The overall consensus was YES (83% of the presidents, 74% of deans of instruction, 48% of faculty senate presidents). Respondents reported increased awareness and concern about the quality of instruction, and many respondents felt that the process of developing an evaluation program was a constructive action. The major obstacle to assessing whether or not the program is contributing to improved instruction is the problem of time--it may be too early to assess the impact of the program. A second problem is that many faculty members felt that there was too much busy work and paper shuffling involved and that there was a lack of helpful feedback.

Respondents were also asked if the evaluation program has affected campus morale and relationships. There was consensus among all respondent categories that at this early stage of the evaluation program (end of the first year) there has been little change in morale and relationships because of Senate Bill 696. However, 23% of faculty senate presidents and 7% of the deans of instruction did report that faculty morale was adversely affected by the evaluation program. There was no significant change reported in campus/community relationships, administrative/board relationships, or faculty/board relationships. Eighty-four percent of the senate presidents and 59% of the deans of instruction reported good working relationships between faculty and administration in the development of the evaluation program. Some respondents from both groups indicated that there were cases of apprehension and distrust, hostility and threatening relationships. However, it was encouraging to the survey team to note that <u>most</u> of the groups involved in the evaluation program reported a spirit of professionalism and cooperation in implementing Senate Bill 696.

In terms of student/faculty relationships, the majority of faculty senate presidents, deans of instruction, and students indicated no significant change. Problems reported included concern about student evaluation instruments, student power over faculty, and uses and abuses of student questionnaires. On

the positive side, many respondents reported good relationships and healthy attitudes; many students believe they are now more involved in the educational program and that they have a more effective voice in their own education.

Changes in Roles of Participants

One concern of the survey team involved recommendations from respondents about possible changes in the roles of those who participate in the evaluation process.

Faculty: In regard to the role of the faculty in the evaluation process, respondents suggested two changes: (1) faculty should play a more active role in the development and refinement of the evaluation process and should view the process as a vital professional responsibility; and (2) some faculty and trustees felt that there should be more faculty evaluation of administrators.

Trustees: The respondents felt that the role of the trustees should continue to be one of policy adoption and review only and that trustees should not become involved in the mechanics of the process itself. Respondents also felt that the goal of improvement of instruction would be better served through staff/board consultation prior to formal adoption or alteration of the local evaluation policy or procedure.

Administrators: A number of respondents indicated that administrators, in consultation with faculty, should take the lead in developing in-service training programs--both for orientation and ongoing purposes--to help make the results of the evaluation program accomplish the objective of improved instruction. Several respondents also called for more overall leadership in the development of the evaluation program. However, it should be recognized that effective leadership will require some released time and additional funding and cannot be obtained by simply imposing more tasks on an already heavy workload. A final suggestion made by respondents was that the role of administrators in the evaluation process should be more clearly defined, especially in terms of a definition of leadership and the extent of administrative involvement in the evaluation process.

Students: There were several concerns expressed about the role of students in the evaluation process. There was a consensus among groups that more effective student involvement should be achieved. Major areas of concern included the need to develop more usable evaluation instruments, the need to reexamine policies on the use of findings from student evaluation, and the need to better prepare and guide students to make evaluations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are eight recommendations which evolved as a result of this study.

Respondents' Recommendations

Respondents to the questionnaire consistently recommended these improvements in evaluation practices, policies, and procedures.

1. Timing of, and Feedback from, the Evaluation Process: In response to questions concerning the timing of the evaluation process and feedback from it, there was a consensus among trustees, administrators, and faculty that the evaluation process should occur early in the year with the optimal time being perhaps at the end of the first semester or quarter. There was also consensus among the groups that evaluation should be followed by information feedback as soon as possible. Respondents felt that feedback was necessary to insure attainment of improved instruction, and that this feedback should be a systematic and regular process and not left to chance or accident.

2. Inservice Training: Closely allied to timing of evaluation and feedback of information from it is a need for inservice faculty development programs. A number of respondents recommended that faculty development programs would not only bring about better evaluation procedures but could contribute significantly to the improvement of instruction. In short, what many respondents recommended is perhaps best reflected in the words of O'Banion:

> "The purpose of a development program is, ultimately, to enhance opportunities for student development through the professional growth of each staff member . . . The aim is to develop a program that is so woven into the fabric of the school that staff accept as normal the opportunity to plan and carry out activities that help them improve their teaching, administering, and counseling . . . Evaluation processes should also be integrated with the program to allow the individual and the college to determine progress."[13]

3. Use of Evaluation Instruments: Respondents were asked to recommend changes in the use of evaluation instruments. Respondents indicated that there is a need to continue to refine and improve evaluation instruments, especially student evaluation instruments, allowing for flexibility and unique needs of differing teaching disciplines. Again, respondents expressed concern about the amount of paperwork and time involved in the evaluation process.

Survey Team's Recommendations

The survey team agrees completely with the recommendations of the respondents. In addition, the survey team makes the following recommendations.

4. Funding for Inservice Training: Clearly, the passage of Senate Bill 696 imposed a significant burden of work, time and cost on the already heavy workload of community college personnel. No state funds were provided to help alleviate that burden. The survey team recommends that additional funding be provided for inservice efforts to improve evaluation programs. In addition, future state mandated programs should be accompanied by adequate state funding to assure the highest level of development of the program.

5. More Experimentation: The survey team recommends that more experimental approaches to evaluation (e.g., use of video tape or the sharing among colleges of qualified personnel) be attempted and the results disseminated.

6. Statewide Clearinghouse: A recognized statewide clearinghouse for information and resources about the evaluation of community college personnel should be established. This state body could serve as a readily accessible storehouse of information and could focus attention on continuing and emerging developments in evaluation programs.

7. Permanent Local Committees on the Improvement of Instruction: Each local community college campus should establish a permanent committee on the improvement of instruction through evaluation programs. As with the state body, this permanent committee could ensure a more systematic and effective growth of the evaluation program than the presently existing pattern of *ad hoc* committees.

8. A Further Study: The survey team recommends that an extensive in-depth study of the growth and development of evaluation programs for community college personnel be conducted in the 1975-76 academic year. This study should include an assessment similar to the preliminary assessment made in this report and should also make use of case studies to report about specific differing kinds of evaluation programs.

SUMMARY

As the 1960's was an era of expansion, innovation, and reform in higher education, it appears that the 1970's will be an era of accountability for that expansion, innovation, and reform. With the much talked-about taxpayer revolt and the ensuing calls for belt tightening and cost benefit studies, the colleges of America will be called on to increasingly compete for, and justify expenditure of, scarce dollars. Perhaps nowhere is the increased interest in educational accountability more vocal than in the growing demands by legislatures and the public for reviews of tenure and for more effective evaluation of teaching.

As a result of this concern, a cooperative effort among community college organizations and state agencies led to the development of a position paper and the passage of Senate Bill 696 (1971).

Essentially, the new tenure law required that faculty members as defined must be evaluated periodically, at least once every two years for regular (permanent) teachers and at least once every year for contract (probationary) teachers.

The fundamental goal of the new law was to improve the quality of instruction in the California community colleges. To help implement the new legislation, community college leaders from the coalition of organizations sponsored conferences on evaluation in the winter and spring of 1971-72.

As a followup to these conferences, it was decided to conduct a statewide survey of local evaluation policies, procedures, and problems of implementing evaluation programs on the campuses. A survey team was formed and, after extensive discussion, the team decided upon the following major areas for study: (1) the process of development of the evaluation program; (2) procedures utilized in the first year of implementing Senate Bill 696; (3) perceptions of the effectiveness of differing evaluation techniques; (4) problems encountered in implementing Senate Bill 696; and (5) recommendation for improving evaluation of certificated personnel.

Over 700 questionnaires were mailed to the following groups: all community college presidents, all deans of instruction, all faculty senate presidents, all student body presidents, a random sample of nearly 200 community college faculty, and a sample of local community college trustees.

In addition to the questionnaires, the survey team gathered written policies from over 90 community colleges and conducted an analysis of major features of board-adopted evaluation policies. The survey team was also concerned with evaluation theory. For perspective, the team reviewed much of the literature about evaluation and used many of the theoretical issues uncovered as a basis for the development of the survey instruments.

It was recognized that evaluation of the implementation of Senate Bill 696 would be necessary on an ongoing basis. The survey team also recognized that the colleges had less than a full academic year to develop evaluation procedures at the time of the survey, but the magnitude of this

mandated statewide effort, coupled with requests from colleges for assistance in developing evaluation programs, justified this preliminary survey and report. It is clear that evaluation programs will require continuous assessment, refinement, and improvement. Under no circumstances should they be abandoned, however.

In conclusion, the survey team would like to reiterate and lend support to the principle that the fundamental purpose of evaluation is to help teachers and administrators grow as professionals and thereby improve the quality of instruction rather than to provide a means by which community college staff members are more easily punished or dismissed.

After analyzing hundreds of questionnaires and scores of district policies, after attending countless committee meetings, and after having innumerable conversations with faculty, trustees, administrators, and students, the survey team believes that the spirit of the evaluation enterprise is perhaps best captured in the words of John Gustad:

> "It is not so much that what we are doing is demonstrably bad. Rather, we are demonstrably ignorant about entirely too much of what we are doing. At least as much as our students we need to learn which of our teaching practices are appropriate and adequate and which are not so that we can learn to do better. To this end we need to be able to set standards for our own behavior. We need to do, in short, what we are asking our students to do. But this should not be too much to ask of a profession made up of women and men who have chosen to spend their lives learning."[14]

FOOTNOTES

1. Press release from the office of State Senator Albert S. Rodda, December 3, 1971, p. 2.

2. Ibid., p. 1.

3. California Education Code, Chapter 2, Division 10, Article 5.3, Section 13481.05.

4. California Education Code, Chapter 2.5, Division 18.5, Article 1, Section 25490.30.

5. Ibid.

6. Astin, A., and Lee, C., "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers," in Lee, C., Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

7. Kent, L., "Student Evaluation of Teaching," in Lee, C., Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

8. Cohen, A., and Brawer, F., Measuring Faculty Performance, American Association of Junior Colleges and ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, Washington, D.C.

9. Ibid.

10. Kent, op. cit.

11. Jarrett, J., Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Teaching, University of California, Berkeley, p. 78.

12. Case, C., "Beyond Evaluation: The Quality Control Model of Evaluation and the Development Model for Faculty Growth and Evaluation," in Myers, L., (Ed.), Administration of Tenure, Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Evaluation for the California Community Colleges, April, 1971, p. F-3.

13. O'Banion, T., "Patterns of Staff Development," in Cohen, A., (Ed.), Toward a Professional Faculty, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1973, p. 21.

14. Gustad, J., "Evaluation of Teaching Performance, Issues and Possibilities," in Lee, C., Improving College Teaching, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 20 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION